

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 7, 2004

LR 11, 14

SENATOR SMITH: ...the Council Bluffs casinos, probably even closer than some Iowa shops, those closest to it, aren't buying this, aren't buying, well, let's put makeup on one person of ill repute, thinking that all of a sudden it's a better situation. Not at all. Not at all. We are at a point where we have to make tough decisions. Senator Vrtiska makes me a little nervous, saying...well, not really saying, but (laugh) making me wonder how he's going to vote. And it's one of the last votes he'll cast. I hope he doesn't disappoint me, but that's his decision.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes. Thank you. Mr. President and members, I think we've forgotten where we are here. We're on a motion to return this bill to Select File for a specific amendment. And that specific amendment is one that I think Senator Smith had on LR 14CA, if my memory...or yeah, LR 14CA, if my memory is correct. And it essentially says that if a location has been determined and a casino built, then you...after five years, you have to take a vote of the people in that county to approve or disapprove. My feeling...my personal feeling about this is that people aren't going to vote to get rid of something, especially if it's only been five years. But even at that, I...we've been over this before on the floor, but if you looked at all the counties in Iowa who voted on whether to keep a casino or not, they all voted more than 60 percent, some of them higher than that, not to get rid of their casinos. So my perspective on this is that all we're doing is putting another requirement on counties to hold another election, which of course costs money. The other thing about it is, if you are interested in having a casino come into your county, this will be a real damper on that effort, because a casino is not going to be too excited about building if they don't think they're going to be in existence for a very long period of time. So I don't think this is necessary, and I would argue against the amendment. And in addition to that then, I would argue against returning the bill